UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/483,745	01/17/2000	Loredana Abramo	Abramo-1	8778

48116   7590   11/28/2006

FAY SHARPE/LUCENT
1100 SUPERIOR AVE
SEVENTH FLOOR
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER
HUYNH, CONG LAC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 August 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12 and 15-22* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12, 15-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 8/30/06 to the

application filed on 1/17/00.

2.   Claim 23 is added.

3.   Claims 1-12, 15-23 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 7, 15, and 19 are

independent claims.

4.   This action is made final since the objections of claims 4-6, and 16 have been

withdrawn in view of the reference Gupta et al. (US 6,226,516).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1, 7-8, 10, 12, 15, 18-20, 22 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over McDuff et al. (US Pat App Pub No. 2001/0012356, 8/9/01, filed

9/30/97) in view of Probert, Jr. et al. (US Pat No. 6,549,918 B1, 4/15/03, filed 9/21/98).

Regarding independent claim 1, Mcduff discloses:

-      receiving raw switch data from a digital switching system, the raw switch data is

        stored by the digital switching system in a switch database ([0007], [0033]:

        receiving raw data from switching mechanism included in the telecommunication

system and generating events about calling activity based on the raw data

implies that the telecommunication system includes the digital switching system

with a switch database for storing the received raw switch data to be processed)

- storing the call information which is the raw cellular information in a table ([0083]-

[0086])

Mcduff does not disclose:

- converting said raw data into a format compatible with a predefined spreadsheet

program

- outputting converted data to and storing said converted data in at least one

predefined workbook of said spreadsheet program

Probert discloses:

- converting said raw data into a format compatible with a predefined spreadsheet

program (figure 2 and col 8, lines 17-59: the network system includes the

dynamic conversion filter driver to *convert data from one format to another*,

including providing data *in spreadsheet format* where the data to be converted is

from the server)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

was made to have combined Probert into Mcduff since Probert discloses the benefit of

converting data in one format to the spreadsheet format applied in the network system,

providing the advantage to incorporate into Mcduff for converting the raw data stored in

the switch database the table format in Mcduff into the spreadsheet format for easily

performing calculations relating to business data.

Mcduff and Probert do not disclose outputting converted data to and storing said

converted data in at least one predefined workbook of said spreadsheet program.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to have modified Mcduff and Probert to include said outputting and

storing features since it was well known in the art that once the data is converted into a

format such as spreadsheet, the data is displayed at the client, which is a form of

outputting data, and the data is stored in the memory for later use. The combination of

the outputting and storing features to Mcduff and Probert would help providing and

checking data when needed and keeping the received data for later use.

Independent claim 7 is for an apparatus of method claim 1, and is rejected under the

same rationale.

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Mcduff and Probert do not explicitly

disclose the operation of said data receiver, data converter and data output device are

adapted to be triggered via a user's "Make Workbook" command. However, it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was

made to have modified Probert to include the user's Make Workbook command since it

was well known that spreadsheet has the command such as AutoFormat for formatting

a workbook, which is a form of the Make Workbook command.

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Mcduff further discloses that the

raw switch data includes recent change and verify data ([0067], [0071]).

Claim 12 is for an apparatus of method claim 10, and is rejected under the same

rationale.

Regarding independent claim 15, Mcduff discloses:

-   receiving raw switch data from a digital switch ([007], [0033], [0039])

-   storing the raw switch data, which is the call information, in a table ([0082]-

    [0086])

Mcduff does not disclose:

-   converting said raw data into a format compatible with a predefined spreadsheet

    program

-   outputting converted data to and storing said converted data in at least one

    predefined workbook of said spreadsheet program

Probert discloses:

-   converting said raw data into a format compatible with a predefined spreadsheet

    program (figure 2 and col 8, lines 17-59: the network system includes the

    dynamic conversion filter driver to *convert data from one format to another*,

    including providing data *in spreadsheet format* where the data to be converted is

    from the server)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Probert into Mcduff since Probert discloses the benefit of converting data in one format to the spreadsheet format applied in the network system, providing the advantage to incorporate into Mcduff for converting the raw data stored in the switch database the table format in Mcduff into the spreadsheet format. Mcduff and Probert do not disclose outputting converted data to and storing said converted data in at least one predefined workbook of said spreadsheet program. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Mcduff and Probert to include said outputting and storing features since it was well known in the art that once the data is converted into a format such as spreadsheet, the data is displayed at the client, which is a form of outputting data, and the data is stored in the memory for later use. The combination of the outputting and storing features to Mcduff and Probert would help providing and checking data when needed and keeping the received data for later use.

Regarding claim 18, which is dependent on claim 15, Mcduff further discloses that the raw switch data includes recent change and verify data ([0067], [0071]).

Claims 19 and 22 are for an apparatus of method claims 15 and 18, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 20 includes the same limitation of apparatus claim 8, and is rejected under the same rationale.

7.   Claims 2-3, 9, 11, 17, 21 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mcduff in view of Probert as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Boyle et al. (US Pat No. 5,661,789, 8/26/97).

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Mcduff discloses:

- prior to said receiving, converting and outputting steps, installing said digital switch (0033], [0039]: the fact that the call center includes switching mechanism for switching the call data implies that a digital switch is installed in the system for performing the switching function)

Mcduff and Probert do not disclose:

- performing said receiving, converting and outputting steps as part of a New Product Introduction test

Boyle discloses a new product testing is performed at a digital switch where raw data is received (col 1, line 60 to col 2, line 39).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Boyle into Mcduff and Probert since performing new product testing at the digital switch in Boyle would provide the advantage to include in Mcduff and Probert for using various data including product testing data at the digital switch for various service purposes.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Mcduff discloses:

- prior to said receiving, converting and outputting steps, installing said digital
  switch ([0033], [0039]: the fact that the call center includes switching mechanism
  for switching the call data implies that a digital switch is installed in the system for
  performing the switching function)

Mcduff does not disclose:

- performing said receiving, converting and outputting steps as part of a Customer
  Acceptance test

Boyle discloses:

- performing said receiving, converting and outputting steps as part of a Customer
  Acceptance test (col 1, lines 55-60, col 2, lines 40-57)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

was made to have combined Boyle into Mcduff and Probert since performing customer

acceptance test at the digital switch in Boyle would provide the advantage to include in

Mcduff and Probert for using various data including product testing data at the digital

switch for various service purposes.

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Mcduff does not disclose that the

switch data includes testing data, which is one of hardware change data, software

change data, switching activity data, *testing data*, troubleshooting data, and new

product installation data.

Boyle discloses a new product testing is performed at a digital switch where raw data is received (col 1, line 60 to col 2, line 39).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Boyle into Mcduff and Probert since performing new product testing at the digital switch in Boyle would provide the advantage to include in Mcduff and Probert for using various data including product testing data at the digital switch for various service purposes.

Claim 11, which is dependent on claim 7, include the same limitations as in claim 9, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 17 includes the same limitations as in claim 9, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 21 is for an apparatus of method claim 9, and is rejected under the same rationale.

8.   Claims 4-6, 16 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mcduff in view of Probert as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Gupta et al. (US 6,226,516, 5/1/01, filed 3/30/98).

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Mcduff and Probert does not
disclose:

-   using the output of said converter as a layout, preparing scripts containing
    Database Modification Commands

-   transferring said scripts to said digital switching system

-   via said digital switching system, executing said scripts to modify the switch
    database associated with the raw switch data

Gupta discloses:

-   using the data at the switch center, preparing scripts containing Database
    Modification Commands (col 1, line 58 to col 2, line 19: having scripts for
    modifying data at switch center implies that the scripts contain Database
    Modification Commands)

-   transferring said scripts to said digital switching system (col 2, lines 7-19:
    downloading the scripts to the central office for processing switch data shows
    that scripts are transferred to the switching system)

-   via said digital switching system, executing said scripts to modify the switch
    database associated with the raw switch data (col 1, line 58 to col 2, line 67)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
invention was made to have modified Gupta to include data at the switch center to be
converted into spreadsheet format and combined Gupta into Mcduff and Probert for
modifying switch data at the switching system via executing scripts.

Claims 5-6, 16 and 23 include the same limitations as in claim 4, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

9.   Applicants arguments filed 8/30/06 have been considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that McDuff does not disclose a telecommunication network switch. It is not true. McDuff discloses that feature ([0007], [0033]: switch data at a telecommunication network, so it is telecommunication network switch).

Applicants argue that though McDuff uses the phrase "raw data", the raw data of McDuff is regarding calls and not regarding configuration of a telecommunication network switch. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The raw data of McDuff is raw data at the switching system, and so it is the "raw switch data" as recited in claim 1.

Applicants argue that Probert does not disclose or suggest receiving raw switch data from a digital switch system.

Examiner agrees. However, McDuff, in combination with Probert, discloses that feature.

Conclusion

10.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Gupta et al. (US 6,226,516, 05-2001).

Heninger et al. (US 6,470,349, 10-2002).

Sudoh et al. (US 2006/0053468, 03-2006).

Hurst (US 7,099,664, 08-2006).

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-4125. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-4125.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cong-Lac Huynh
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2178
11/16/06